

January 11, 2012

Reply to the Office Action dated October 14, 2011

Page 6 of 7

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-5 and 7-14 are pending in this application. The Examiner has withdrawn claims 8-12 from consideration. In this Amendment, Applicant AMENDS claims 1, 13, and 14 and CANCELS claims 6, 15, and 16.

Applicant's counsel greatly appreciates the courtesies extended by the Examiner in the interview of January 3, 2012. Applicant's counsel and the Examiner discussed possible amendments to overcome the outstanding prior art rejections. The Examiner stated that Applicant's claims would be allowable if amended to recite that the third electrode is the case of the display. Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner.

Applicant respectfully requests entry of this Amendment After Final Rejection because this application is in condition for allowance because, as discussed above, Applicant has amended the claims to recite that the third electrode is the case of the display as suggested by the Examiner. See MPEP § 714.13.

In § 5 on page 2 of Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Herbert (U.S. 5,777,596). In § 11 on page 4 of Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 4, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herbert in view of Nakazono et al. (JP 9-251820). In § 15 on page 6 of Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herbert in view of Tsunoda et al. (U.S. 4,592,031). In § 19 on page 8 of Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herbert in view of Nakazono et al. and further in view of Tsunoda et al.

As noted above, Applicant has canceled claims 6, 15, and 16. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 1-5, 7, 13, and 14 are moot in view of Applicant's amendment to claims 1, 13, and 14 to recite the feature that the third electrode is the case of the display because, as admitted by the Examiner, the prior art of record does not teach or suggest this feature.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art of record, applied alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements

Application No. 10/598,156

January 11, 2012

Reply to the Office Action dated October 14, 2011

Page 7 of 7

recited in claims 1, 13, and 14 of the present application. Claims 2-5 and 7 depend upon claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner rejoin, consider, and allow claims 8-12 when generic claim 1 is allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 11, 2012

/Peter Medley #56,125/
Attorneys for Applicant

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP

1800 Alexander Bell Drive, Suite 200

Reston, VA 20191

Telephone: (571) 313-7440

Facsimile: (571) 313-7421

Joseph R. Keating

Registration No. 37,368

Peter Medley

Registration No. 56,125